

DEC 30 1962

DENVER, COLO. Approved For Release 1999/09/17 : CIA
POST COPYRGT FOIAb3b

EVENING 271,758
SUNDAY 352,027

Editor of 'Warfare State'

YOUR editorial on Dec. 9, "Hold On, the Pentagon is on Our Side," was a toadying piece of journalism.

As Fred Cook's editor at Macmillan while "The Warfare State" was being prepared, I feel a professional as well as a personal and civic duty to defend him.

You say that John Loosbrock (of the Air Force Magazine) "demolishes" Cook's thesis that the combined power of industry and the military has gotten beyond control in this land. Loosbrock disputes Cook on several points, but doesn't say a convincing word in denial of Cook's thesis.

He shows us, for example, how Cook presents an edited version of a crucial speech by Charles E. Wilson, but he altogether avoids Cook's major point, that Wilson obviously was arguing for a permanent war economy in which industry and military could happily loll.

Later, Loosbrock has Cook say that the U.S. "conceived the cold war." Cook didn't say that. He did say that our hands weren't lily white, however, but Loosbrock has arranged not to argue that little point. Another trick of Loosbrock is to invent a contradiction, claim it was Cook's, peck it down, and say "Aha! what a rogue!"

He also tries to smear Cook by referring to his articles in

The Nation (an offensive magazine, Loosbrock thinks; leftish, you know) on Hiss and Remington. It so happens that Cook found unsaid things that needed saying, not only about "closed" cases like Hiss and Remington, but about sacred institutions like the FBI, the CIA, and the Pentagon, which supposedly exist purely for our protection.

Cook is perhaps the last good man in a tradition—muckraking, if you will—that enhances American journalistic history. It is a matter of devoting one's life to reporting what is unpopular and unfashionable, and what established channels are too proud or too afraid to print. It is a matter of great courage.

Loosbrock, finally, is misinformed about the circumstances of Cook's dismissal from the New York World Telegram and Sun, an occasion that he celebrates for nearly half a column, and which he cites as evidence of Cook's questionable integrity. The story goes that Cook and his partner Gene Gleason claimed over TV that they'd been offered a bribe to suppress damaging information that they'd gathered about the Title I slum clearance project in New York; before the District Attorney they retracted the claim, and they were fired. The truth is that only Gleason made the claim and retracted it, but that Cook's association with him (they had made a great team) was injurious; and Cook will have to die before the Loosbrocks of this world will cease plaguing him with that distorted story.

CPYRGHT

Some comfort, this unctuous "in these extraordinary days there is an understandable concern..." I'll say that. For comfort, you who are too stupid, servile or scared to question the motives of those men to whom we give fifty billions every year, and the equivalent in power and prestige, and who would lose all that if peace struck the world. Those who are "understandably concerned" had better read The Book for balm.

JOHN W. BLANPIED

Des Moines, Iowa.